

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**JAN 25 2002**

**TENTH CIRCUIT**

---

**PATRICK FISHER**  
Clerk

CAROLYN D. CRAIG

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE;  
ARLEY DENNIS; STEVE MANNING;  
RON PROVINE; and TERRY SMITH,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 01-6330

(D.C. No. 00-CV-1253-L)

(W.D. Okla.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

---

Before **SEYMOUR** and **McKAY**, Circuit Judges, and **BRORBY**, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

After examining Appellant's brief and the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist the determination of this appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument.

Ms. Craig, proceeding pro se, filed a motion for default judgment in the district court in this civil rights action. The district court denied Ms. Craig's

---

\*This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, res judicata, and collateral estoppel. The court generally disfavors the citation of orders and judgments; nevertheless, an order and judgment may be cited under the terms and conditions of 10th Cir. R. 36.3.

motion for default judgment because Ms. Craig failed to properly serve the Defendants. The court file reflected that Ms. Craig attempted to serve the Department of the Air Force by certified letter at Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma City.

On March 29, 2001, the district court ordered Ms. Craig to file proof of service or show cause why service had not been made no later than April 20, 2001, or the district court would “dismiss this action without prejudice without further notice.” R. at 9. In the Order, the district court correctly stated that attempting to serve the Department of the Air Force by certified letter at Tinker Air Force Base did not comply with the requirements of Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Id.

Ms. Craig filed a response and attached a “Domestic Return Receipt” purportedly showing that “The Department of the Air Force was sent a certified letter” at Tinker Air Force Base. On July 31, 2001, the district court dismissed the present action without prejudice finding Ms. Craig’s response inadequate. We agree with the district court that attempting to serve the Department of the Air Force by certified letter at Tinker Air Force Base does not comply with the requirements of Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Ms. Craig made no attempt to file proof of service or show cause why service had not been made to the other four Defendants.

Plaintiff's appeal is **DISMISSED**.

Entered for the Court:

Monroe G. McKay  
Circuit Judge